Plaintiffs,		ORDER 07 Civ. 8410	(RMB) (GV	WG)
DEAN ANGELLE, DENISE ANGELLE, Defendants.	: : X	The second of th		3/1/10V

The Court is in receipt of a letter dated March 10. 2008. The application to file a motion for a protective order is denied, without prejudice, for failure to comply with paragraph 2.A of this Court's Individual Practices.

Defendants seem to understand that the letter was sent in violation of this paragraph but justify it on the ground that their responses to plaintiff's discovery requests are due today. This is not a reason to violate the Court's rule, however. To the extent that defendants have objections to discovery requests, they should simply state them in their responses and should do so without any advance ruling by the Court. See, e.g., Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(b)(4), 34(b)(2)(B).

Perhaps defendants meant merely to seek an extension of time to respond to the discovery requests. The Court assumes that the parties can work out a schedule for responses. If not, a separate application may be made for this purpose.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 10, 2008

New York, New York

GABRIEL W. GORENSTEIN United States Magistrate Judge